

REMARKS

Claims 2-3, 5-8, 10-11, 14-15, 18 and 22-23 were pending in the application. Claims 10 and 22-23 have been cancelled. Claims 26-31 are newly submitted. No new matter has been added. Accordingly claims 2-3, 5-8, 11, 14-15, 18 and 26-31 remain pending in the application. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the amendments to the claims and the following remarks.

I. The § 102/103 Rejections

Claims 2-3, 5-7, 10-11, 14-15 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,420,605 ("Vouri").

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vouri in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,580,434 ("Curtis").

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Claim 3, as amended, recites a computer system including an input section operable to present a zoom factor to a user. The zoom factor specifies a pre-determined magnification amount for zooming in on an image displayed on a display screen of a display apparatus and is a number equal to a first resolution of the display apparatus divided by a second resolution of the display apparatus.

A potential advantage of such a computer system is that instead of displaying resolutions – e.g., (1024x786, 640x480, and the like) – to a user, a zoom factor is presented to a user (specification, page 6, lines 11-13).

A. Vouri Fails To Disclose Presenting A Zoom Factor To A User In Which The Zoom Factor Specifies A Pre-determined Magnification Amount For Zooming In On An

*Image And Is A Number Equal To A First Resolution Of A Display Apparatus Divided
By A Second Resolution Of The Display Apparatus*

Vouri discloses a method of resetting a screen display mode in a computer system having a display monitor (see Abstract). In particular, Vouri's method permits a user to alter display characteristics such as a screen resolution and/or color depth without requiring that either currently open applications or the operating system to be exited and reloaded (col. 2, ll. 14-19). The Examiner recognizes that Vouri fails to disclose presenting a zoom factor to a user that is equal to a first resolution divided by a second resolution. The Examiner, however, asserts that these limitation, absent from Vouri and recited in claim 3, is disclosed by McKay.

*B. McKay Fails To Disclose Presenting A Zoom Factor To A User In Which The Zoom Factor Specifies A Pre-determined Magnification Amount For Zooming In On An Image And Is A Number Equal To A First Resolution Of A Display Apparatus Divided
By A Second Resolution Of The Display Apparatus*

McKay discloses a method an apparatus for modifying screen resolution based on available memory (see Abstract). Referring to FIGs. 8 and 9, McKay discloses zoom control logic 810 (a software routine) that controls the identification of a correct zoom factor and the setting of hardware components (e.g., a screen) based on the zoom factor. In particular, the zoom control logic first identifies a current video resolution. The zoom control logic then creates a magnification table (used to increase horizontal screen resolution) or a zoom table (used to decrease the horizontal screen resolution) based on whether the identified video resolution is supported by available memory of a frame buffer. The zoom control logic then determines a new horizontal resolution for the screen using either the magnification table or the zoom table, and programs PLLs based on the new horizontal resolution (col. 13, line 38 – col. 14, line 16).

While McKay discloses creating a magnification table (or creating a zoom table), neither the magnification table nor the zoom table is presented to a user. Instead, (as discussed above) McKay clearly discloses that the zoom control logic 810 (a software routine) controls the identification of a correct zoom factor, and not a user. McKay, therefore, fails to disclose an input section operable to present a zoom factor to a user, in which the zoom factor specifies a pre-determined magnification amount for zooming in on an image displayed on a display screen of a display apparatus and is a number equal to a first resolution of the display apparatus divided by a second resolution of the display apparatus, as recited in claim 3.

C. The claim has limitations not taught by either reference

To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art.

Both Vouri and McKay fail to disclose an input section operable to present a zoom factor to a user, in which the zoom factor specifies a pre-determined magnification amount for zooming in on an image displayed on a display screen of a display apparatus and is a number equal to a first resolution of the display apparatus divided by a second resolution of the display apparatus. Consequently, the combination of Vouri and McKay cannot render claim 3 obvious.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 3, and the claims that depend therefrom, are in condition for allowance.

D. Other Independent Claims

Claims 11 and 18 each incorporates limitations similar to those of claim 3. Claims 11 and 18 (and the claims that depend therefrom) are also allowable over Vouri and McKay for reasons corresponding to those set forth with respect to claim 3.

Should any unresolved issues remain, Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,
SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP

June 28, 2006
Date



Kelvin M. Vivian
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 53,727
(650) 475-1448